UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,642	04/04/2006	Mikko Nevalainen	BKS.002.WUS	8247

7590   08/04/2008

Hollingsworth & Funk
8009 34Th Avenue South
Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER
HUSSAIN, IMAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 July 2008_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-8,10,12-20 and 22_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-8,10,12-20 and 22_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07 July

2008 has been entered.

2.   Applicant's amendment filed 07 July 2008 has been received and made of

record. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended.

3.   Claims 1-8, 10, 12-20 and 22 are pending in Application 10/561642.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 07 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Varland and Demers is improper as it is

based on hindsight reasoning.

        In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of

obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon

hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does

not include knowledge gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In this case, Demers explicitly notes that a main design purpose of the Bayou architecture is to use mobile terminal devices to replicate the functionality of a centralized, highly-available database service [Demers: Page 2 Column 2 Paragraph 1]. There is no reason that such could not be Varland's clearinghouse service.

Applicant argues that incorporating Demers' teachings into Varland would undermine the privacy objective of Varland.

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner notes that there is no mention of loss of privacy in Demers. Varland discloses that all communications are encoded for privacy. There is no reason why such encoding could not be maintained with the modifications of Demers. Moreover, secure measures for peer-to-peer distributed databases are well known in the art.

Applicant further argues that Demers is nonanalogous art.

In response to Applicant's argument that Demers is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of Applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Demers is clearly drawn to addressing the problem of sharing profile data without the need for a fixed central server [Demers: Page 2 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

Applicant additionally argues that neither Varland nor Demers alone, or in combination, teaches or suggests a mobile device compares and matches preference information.

In response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Varland discloses a server device that compares and matches (etc.) preference information. Demers discloses a means for running a profile/preference server on a mobile device. Therefore, the combination of Varland and Demers teaches the claimed device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-8, 10, 17-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by John Varland (WO 01/86997 A1, hereinafter Varland) in view of Alan Demers et al. (*The Bayou Architecture*, hereinafter Demers).

Regarding claim 1, Varland discloses a *method for determining and notifying users having substantially matching preference profiles* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22], *for accessing a multiple access online application* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26] *destined for a plurality of mobile terminal devices each being connected to a wireless communication network* [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30] *and being related to said users, said method comprising:*

       -receiving a preference profile including identification data and preference data related to at least another one of said users, from a mobile terminal related to said at least one other user [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-2 and 9-14]*;*

       -saving said received identification data and said received preference data in a user database, said user database containing preference data of at least a third other user [Varland: Page 7 (6) Lines 19-23]*;*

       -comparing said received preference data with the preference data contained in the user database for determining users of substantially matching preference data [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19]*;*

       -determining a plurality of users having said substantially matching preference data [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19]*; and*

-sending a notification to each of said mobile terminals related to said determined

users [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that the receipt of information occurs *in a*

mobile terminal device related to one of said users or that the comparing, determining,

and receiving steps occur *in the mobile terminal device which received the preference*

profile.

However, Demers teaches that such occurs *in a mobile terminal device related to*

one of said users [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both

describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme

of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the

matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because

in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a

non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Varland and Demers discloses *granting to each*

of said notified users an access to said multiple access online application [Varland:

Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Regarding claim 3, Varland discloses a *method for notifying a user having a preference*

profile substantially matching with at least one other user [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-

22]*, for accessing a multiple access online application* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26]

destined for a plurality of mobile terminal devices each being connected to a wireless

communication network [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30] *and being related to users,*

comprising:

   -sending a preference profile including identification data and preference data of

said user to a server connected to said wireless communication network, via said

network [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and 9-14] *with access to a multiple access*

online application [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26]*; and*

   -receiving a notification from said server, said notification comprising an offer to

get access to said multiple access online application according to said preference data,

wherein said notification comprises data to enable an access of said user to said

multiple access online application [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

   Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a mobile terminal device*

and related to another of said users.

   However, Demers teaches that *the server is a mobile terminal device and related*

to another of said users [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

   Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both

describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme

of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the

matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because

in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a

non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Varland and Demers teaches *accessing said*

application according to said received data to enable an access of said user to said

multiple access online application [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Regarding claim 5, Varland teaches *a method of determining and notifying users having*

a substantially matching profile preference, for accessing a multiple access online

application destined for a plurality of mobile terminal devices each being connected to a

wireless communication network and being related to said users, comprising:

    -sending a preference profile including identification data and preference data of

a user to a server connected to said wireless communication network, via said network

[Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-2 and 9-14], *wherein the server is a device with access to*

a multiple access online application [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26];

    -receiving, in the server, the preference profile from a mobile terminal related to

the user [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-2 and 9-14];

    -saving said received identification data and said received preference data in a

user database, said user database containing preference data of at least a third other

user [Varland: Page 7 (6) Lines 19-23];

-comparing said received preference data with the preference data contained in the user database for determining users of substantially matching preference data [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19];

-determining a plurality of users having said substantially matching preference data [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19]; *and*

-sending a notification to each of the mobile terminals related to said determined users [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22]; *and*

-receiving the notification in the mobile terminal related to the user, said notification comprising an offer to get access to said multiple access online application [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26] *according to said preference data, wherein said notification comprises data to enable an access of the user to said multiple access online application* [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a mobile terminal device and related to another of said users* or that the comparing, determining, and receiving steps occur *in the mobile terminal device which received the preference profile*.

However, Demers teaches that *the server is a mobile terminal device and related to another of said users* [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1] and that such steps would occur *in the mobile terminal device which received the preference profile* [Demers: Page 2 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

Regarding claim 6, Varland-Demers discloses that *said wireless communication network is a cellular telephone network* [Varland: Page 5 (4) Lines 35-37].

Regarding claim 7, Varland-Demers discloses that *said notification is a short message or a multimedia message* [Varland: Page 11 (10) Lines 32-34].

Regarding claim 8, Varland-Demers discloses that *said multiple access online application is a wireless communication network game* [Varland: Page 15 (14) Lines 15-22].

Regarding claim 10, Varland teaches *a computer-readable storage medium storing a computer program and when said computer program is run on a* server, *the* server:

-*receives a preference profile including identification data and preference data related to at least another one of said users, from a mobile terminal related to said at least one other user* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-2 and 9-14];

-*saves said received identification data and said received preference data in a user database, said user database containing preference data of at least a third other user* [Varland: Page 7 (6) Lines 19-23];

-*compares said received preference data with the preference data contained in the user database for determining users of substantially matching preference data* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19];

-*determines a plurality of users having said substantially matching preference data* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-19]; *and*

-sends a notification to each of said mobile terminals related to said determined

users [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that the server is a mobile terminal device

and related to a user.

However, Demers teaches that the server is a mobile terminal device related to a

user [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Regarding claim 17, Varland discloses a network system for notifying users having a

matching preference profile [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22], for accessing a multiple

access online application [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26] comprising:

-a wireless communication network [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30];

-a server having access to the multiple access online application [Varland: Page

3 (2) Lines 23-26] and connected to the wireless communication network [Varland:

Page 2 (1) Line 30] configured to receive identification and preference data for the other

users of respective mobile terminal devices in preference profiles [Varland: Page 3 (2)

Lines 1-2 and 9-14], compare the received preference profiles with stored preference

profiles to determine users of substantially matching preference data [Varland: Figure 1

("Match DB")] and send a notification to each of the users determined to have

substantially matching preference data [Varland: Claim 1 ("notification signal")]; and

-a plurality of mobile terminal devices each storing identification and preference

data for a respective user of each of the plurality of mobile terminal devices in a

preference profile [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and 9-14], each device configured to

transmit a respective preference profile to the server [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and

9-14] *and receive a notification from the server* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and 9-14]

via the wireless communication network [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30] *wherein the*

notification includes an offer to get access to the multiple access online application

according to the preference data and data to enable the respective users to access the

multiple access online application [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a mobile terminal device*

related to a user.

However, Demers teaches that *the server is a mobile terminal device related to a*

user [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both

describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme

of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the

matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because

in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a

non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

Regarding claim 18, Varland-Demers discloses that *said wireless communication*

network is a cellular telephone network [Varland: Page 5 (4) Lines 35-37].

Regarding claim 19, Varland-Demers discloses that *said notification is a short message or a multimedia message* [Varland: Page 11 (10) Lines 32-34].

Regarding claim 20, Varland-Demers discloses that *said multiple access online application is a wireless communication network game* [Varland: Page 15 (14) Lines 15-22].

Regarding claim 22, Varland discloses a *computer-readable storage medium storing a computer program and when said computer program is run on a computer or network device, the computer or network device:*

-*sends a preference profile including identification data and preference data of said user to a server connected to said wireless communication network, via said network* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and 9-14] *with access to a multiple access online application* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26]; *and*

-*receives a notification from said server, said notification comprising an offer to get access to said multiple access online application according to said preference data, wherein said notification comprises data to enable an access of said user to said multiple access online application* [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a mobile terminal device and related to another of said users*.

However, Demers teaches that *the server is a mobile terminal device and related to another of said users* [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both

describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme

of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the

matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because

in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a

non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

7.   Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Varland in view of Demers in further view of William F. Zancho (US 5630159

A, hereinafter Zancho).

Regarding claim 12, Varland discloses a network terminal device for notifying a user

having a preference profile substantially matching with at least one other user [Varland:

Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22], *for accessing a multiple access online application* [Varland:

Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26] *destined for a plurality of mobile terminal devices each being*

connected to a wireless communication network [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30] *and being*

related to users, wherein said terminal device is configured to send a preference profile

including identification data and preference data of said user via said interface and via

said network to a server and configured to receive a notification from said server

[Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-4 and 9-14], *wherein the server has access to a multiple*

access online application [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26], *said notification comprising*

an offer to get access to said multiple access online application according to said

preference data, wherein said notification comprises data to enable an access of said

user to said multiple access online application [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines

10-21].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a second mobile terminal*

device related to another of said users.

However, Demers teaches that *the server is a second mobile terminal device*

related to another of said users [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both

describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme

of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the

matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because

in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a

non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

The combination of Varland and Demers does not explicitly disclose that the

terminal comprises:

-*an interface to a wireless communication network for exchanging data with at*

least one server connected to said wireless communication network;

-a database to store identification data and preference data of a user of said

terminal device; and

-a processor connected to said interface and said database.

However, Zancho teaches such an interface [Zancho: Claim 6 ("port couples…

by a wireless connection")], such a database [Zancho: Claim 1 ("session preference

memory… storing preferences")], and such a processor [Zancho: Claim 1 ("controller")].

Varland-Demers and Zancho are analogous art in the same field of endeavor, as

both cover matching of user profiles in a networked environment. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the matching system of Varland-Demers with the memory card and hardware scheme of

Zancho for implementation of a cellular telephone and server because in doing so the

matching system of Varland-Demers would allow for users to transfer profiles

seamlessly from one device to another [Zancho: Column 2 Lines 37-38 and 46-48].

Regarding claim 13, Varland-Demers-Zancho teaches that *said processor is further*

configured to access a multiple access online application via a wireless communication

network, in accordance with said received data to enable said access of said multiple

access online application [Varland: Claim 4 and Page 4 (3) Lines 10-21].

Regarding claim 14, Varland-Demers-Zancho discloses *an interface for connecting an*

exchangeable memory device [Zancho: Figure 1 and Column 2 Lines 49-51].

8.   Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varland in view of Demers in further view of Taniguchi et al. (US 2002/0013869 A1, hereinafter Taniguchi).

Regarding claim 15, Varland teaches *a server for determining and notifying users having substantially matching preference profiles* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 14-22], *for accessing a multiple access online application* [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 23-26] *destined for a plurality of mobile terminal devices each being connected to a wireless communication network* [Varland: Page 2 (1) Line 30], *and being related to said users, wherein said network server comprises:*

        -a database to store data received from said terminal devices [Varland: Figure 1 ("Client DB" and "Position DB")];

        -means for comparing said received preference data with preference data of at least a third other user for determining users of substantially matching preference data [Varland: Figure 1 ("Match DB")]; *and*

        -means for sending a notification to each of said mobile terminals related to said determined users [Varland: Claim 1 ("notification signal")]

        -wherein said interface is adapted to receive a preference profile including identification data and preference data from at least one other mobile terminal [Varland: Page 3 (2) Lines 1-2 and 9-14], *and said database is adapted to store said preference profile* [Varland: Figure 1 ("Client DB" and "Position DB")].

Varland does not explicitly disclose that *the server is a mobile terminal device related to a user.*

However, Demers teaches that *the server is a mobile terminal device related to a user* [Demers: Page 3 Column 1 Paragraph 1].

Varland and Demers are analogous art in the same field of endeavor as both describe mobile communications systems. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mobility scheme of Demers for providing the services of a database server via mobile devices in the matching system of Varland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the matching system of Varland with the mobility scheme of Demers because in doing so, the system would allow for users to share information without being tied to a non-mobile server [Demers: Page 1 Column 2 Paragraph 1].

The combination of Varland and Demers does not explicitly disclose:

-an interface to a wireless communication network for exchanging data with terminal devices connected to said wireless communication network;

-and a processor being connected to said interface and said database to process data;

However, Taniguchi discloses such an interface [Taniguchi: Paragraph 0121] and such a processor [Taniguchi: Paragraph 0121].

Varland-Demers and Taniguchi are analogous art in the same field of endeavor, as both cover client-server communication on a wireless network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the matching system of Varland-Demers with the server components of Taniguchi for

implementation of a cellular telephone and server because in doing so the matching

system of Varland-Demers would allow for a physical implementation of the system.

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Varland-Demers and Taniguchi discloses that

said notification is a short message or a multimedia message [Varland: Page 11 (10)

Lines 32-34].

Conclusion

9.   **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in

the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are

applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses

to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the text of the passage taught by the prior art or disclosed

by the examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully

requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds

of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IMAD HUSSAIN whose telephone number is (571) 270-3628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 0800 to 1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/IH/
Imad Hussain
Examiner, AU 2151

/Salad Abdullahi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157